DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 629 HE 025 524

AUTHOR Carroll, James B.; Gmelch, Walter H.
TITLE A Factor-Analytic Investigation of Role Types and Profiles of Higher Education Department Chairs.
PUB DATE 20 Apr 92
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992). For a related document, see HE 025 525.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Evaluation; *Administrator Role; Colleges; *Department Heads; Higher Education; Job Performance; Job Skills; *Leadership Qualities; *Profiles; Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a study that investigated the role, attitudes, and behaviors of department chairs in higher education. Specifically, the study investigated four objectives: (1) to examine role factors of effective chair performance; (2) to assess the impact of antecedent variables such as individual characteristics (gender, marital status, ethnicity, motivation to serve, career orientation), organizational characteristics (size of department, clerical assistance, ratio of tenured to untenured faculty), and positional characteristics (number of years of service, discipline, current academic rank, rank when hired) on role factors of effective chair performance; (3) to explore the association of department chair performance role factors with the behavioral outcomes of academic productivity, job satisfaction, role ambiguity, role conflict, and occupational stress; and (4) to identify, or begin to develop, a department chair profile associated with each specific performance role. A total of 539 department chairs were surveyed. Factor analysis suggested the roles of Leader, Scholar, Faculty Developer, and Manager. Findings revealed a complex combination and interaction of skills in the various components of the chair job. Findings also revealed that a number of effective leader chairs are often effective manager chairs as well. The paper concludes that the study provides a usable taxonomy of chair roles and some characteristics of those individuals who perceive themselves to be effective in those roles. Contains 23 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345629

A Factor-Analytic Investigation of Role Types and Profiles of Higher Education Department Chairs

James B. Carroll and Walter H. Gmelch

Washington State University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of

American Educational Research Association

April 20, 1992

San Francisco, California

HE025524

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James B. Carroll

Walter H. Gmelch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Factor-Analytic Investigation of Role Types and Profiles of Higher Education Department Chairs

The lists of duties found in the literature specific to department chairs range from the exhaustive 97 activities discovered by a University of Nebraska research team (Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, & Beyer, 1990), or the astonishing 54 varieties of tasks and duties cited in Tucker's (1984) classic book, *Chairing the Academic Department* , or the 40 functions forwarded in a study of Australian department chairs (Moses & Roe, 1990), to the lists of chair duties studied and categorized by higher education scholars, the genesis of which can be traced back to 1969 with Siever's 12 functions, expanded in 1972 to 18 by McCarthy, reduced to 15 by Hoyt in 1976, and expanded again to 27 by Smart and Elton in 1976 (Moses & Roe, 1990, p. 33).

Although these *lists of duties* now appear "to provide comprehensive coverage and have undergone considerable refinement through practical experience and statistical analysis" (Hoyt & Sangler, 1979, p. 293), both practical and theoretical problems arise from this method of inquiry. Practically speaking, only a super human chair could perform all these tasks. Instead, Bragg (1981) found from her research that, more realistically, department chairs select from areas of responsibility they felt most deserving of their personal attention, or most capable of carrying out. Second, from a theoretical perspective, specific listing of chairs duties could be misleading (Lee, 1972), due to the uniqueness associated with *organizational* characteristics (department's discipline, size, prestige, faculty age), *positional* characteristics (term of office, years of service, method of appointment) as well as *personal* characteristics of the chair (age, gender, ethnicity, motivation to serve, career orientation). Instead of resorting to this *pathology* of listing to describe a complex set of responsibilities, the study of

department chairs must move from the fragmented listing of duties to the focused description of meaningful roles department chairs perform.

In 1976 Roach noted the lack of empirical knowledge about the role of department chairs that has existed for decades. However, a few studies on the chair role did start to emerge as early as 1953 when Doyle published one of the first empirically-based descriptions of the role of department chairs, drawing from Gulick and Ursick's POSDCoRB model. He concluded that the department chair's responsibilities are in the areas of planning, directing and coordinating academic or educational policy (Bragg, 1981). Also, in the late 1970's a group of researchers from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University studied 1198 department chairs at 32 doctoral-granting institutions and drew several conclusions regarding department chair roles. From the initial data analysis, McLaughlin, Montgomery and Malpass (1975) defined three predominant chair roles: *academic* (teaching, advising, encouraging research, faculty development, and curriculum development), *administrative* (maintaining budget, records and staff, and representing the department to other university organizations) and *leadership* (selecting supporting, developing, and motivating faculty members). Using the same data set, Smart and Elton (1976) factor analyzed department chairs' use of time in 27 duties and combined them into four roles or factors: a *faculty role* in developing and building faculty and morale, a *coordinator role* of representing the department to outside groups and department planning, a *research role* of obtaining grants and gifts and recruiting and supervising graduate students, and *instructional role* of teaching, advising and recording keeping. In 1981, Bragg conducted a study of 39 chairs at a single research university and identified a typology of four different chair orientations: *faculty* chairs identify their primary responsibilities as the recruitment, facilitation, and development of faculty; *external* chairs focus on department image and

representation in groups outside of the department; *program* chairs are concerned with program and curriculum improvement; and *management* chairs take on coordination roles.

Most significantly, Bragg's research began to tie role orientations to role behaviors of chairs. With regard to role orientation theory, Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek and Rosenthal (1964) suggest that the role behaviors in officially prescribed roles vary based on attitudes individuals bring to the role, not by examining a position in terms of its job description, such as the listing of department chair duties. How individuals function in a specific role is a complex interaction of personal attitudes and social pressures from others within the organization.

Little progress has been made investigating the specific role types since the early studies of Smart and Elton (1976), McLaughlin, Montgomery and Malpass (1975), and Bragg (1981). However, a recent plethora of popularized and conceptual literature dichotomizes conflicting academic and administrative roles facing department chairs (Bare, 1986). While the initial investigations from 1950 to 1980 focused only on the administrative dimension of the chair position, recent studies allude more appropriately to the dual roles of administration *and* scholarship. Moses and Roe (1990) addressed the chairs' non-administrative role of personal research which resulted from their study of department chairs in Australia.

While the previous studies suggest separate labels, orientations, or factors of the department chair role, they also lead to the conclusion that an individual department chair may concentrate efforts more heavily on performing one sub-role over another. The department chair, in effect, performs several sub-roles, each with its own set of role expectations which could be a source of role conflict and ambiguity. This notion that the chair role can be compartmentalized into several

sub-roles, each with different expectations, warrants further examination (Bragg, 1981). Thus far, prior research suggests that the expectations on department chairs regarding their performance vary from department to department and from issue to issue, and may depend, at least in part, on the size, prestige, and disciplinary field of the department.

As Bragg concludes from her research, "...department heads differed in their definition of the headship role. The differences in definition, however, represent differences in emphasis and priorities rather than differences in kind" (p. 149). Therefore, the investigation of department chair roles should not assume that each role definition category, such as developer, administrator or manager, be viewed as an ideal type, but represents differences in emphasis.

This research is concerned with the occupational status of the department chairs in research and doctoral-granting universities. In sociological terms, "each individual occupies a number of statuses or positions in society during a lifetime. Some of the statuses are sequential, such as child and adult. Others may be occupied simultaneously, such as worker and parent ... The way the individual acts or behaves in occupying a status is called a *role* (Bragg, 1981, p. 7). Specifically, this study investigates the simultaneous interaction among the roles of department chairs as they negotiate between the conflict and ambiguity of trying to maintain their *faculty* scholarship status while performing their *administrator* role status as department chair.

The purpose of this study is to extend the previous work on the role, attitudes, and behaviors of department chairs. Specifically the study seeks to further the knowledge on the roles of department chairs by investigating four objectives: (1) to examine role factors of effective chair performance; (2) to assess the impact antecedent variables such as *individual* characteristics (gender, marital status, ethnicity, motivation to serve, career orientation), *organizational*

characteristics (size of department, clerical assistance, ratio of tenured to untenured faculty) and *positional* characteristics (number of years of service, discipline, current academic rank, rank when hired) on role factors of effective chair performance; (3) to explore the association of department chair performance role factors with the behavioral outcomes of academic productivity, job satisfaction, role ambiguity, role conflict and occupational stress; and (4) to identify, or begin to develop, a department chair profile associated with each specific performance role.

Instrument Development

Department chairs in 100 Carnegie Council *Research I and II,* and *Doctorate Granting I and II* institutions (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1987) were surveyed. Studies of department chairs (Creswell, & Bean, 1981; McLaughlin, Montgomery, & Malpass, 1975; Smart, 1976) have suggested that responses would vary dependent on the discipline of the respondents. In this study the Biglan (1973) model for classifying disciplines was used. Biglan clusters academic departments into eight cells based on tri-dimensional comparisons of characteristics of the subject matter of the discipline. One dimension is a determination of the degree to which a discipline has a developed paradigm—hard versus soft. Other dimensions are pure versus applied disciplines, and disciplines which study life systems versus non-life disciplines. The resulting classification names each discipline in terms of these variables (engineering is a hard, applied, non-life discipline). In this study, a department was randomly selected from each Biglan category in each institution, resulting in a sample size of 800 department chairs.

A 36 item questionnaire was sent to the sample chairs. Five hundred and thirty-nine questionnaires were return for a response rate of 67.5 percent. Within

the questionnaire, the chairs were asked to indicate on a five point Likert scale (1 equals *Low*, 5 equals *High*) to the question, "How effective is your performance in each chair duty?" A list of 26 duties of department chairs was included. The list was compiled from the work of McLaughlin, et al (1975), Smart and Elton (1976), and Moses and Roe (1990). Factors of effectiveness in chair duties were determined using principal components analysis. Eigen values were plotted and the scree test (Kachigan, 1982) indicated four factors should be retained. These four factors were rotated using Varimax criterion. Only those items with a loading of ±.40 or greater were included in the factor descriptions (Table 1).

Factor Descriptions

The pattern of loadings on the first factor suggested the role of **Leader**. Chairs who have higher means on this factor feel effective leading the department in both internal and external issues. Internal department leadership includes: soliciting ideas to improve the department, planning and evaluating curriculum development, conducting department meetings, and informing the faculty of department, college and university concerns. Elements related to external leadership on this factor were: coordinating departmental activities with constituents, representing the department at professional meetings, and participating in college and university committee work.

The second factor contains items relating to the chair's role as **Scholar**. Chairs who have higher means on this factor feel effective at a number of items related to their own scholarly productivity: obtaining resources for personal research, maintaining a research program, and remaining current within their academic discipline. A chair's effectiveness at selecting and supervising graduate students also loads into this factor.

The pattern of loadings on the third factor suggested the chair role of **Faculty Developer**. Chairs who have higher means on this factor feel effective in three related areas concerning the success of faculty in their pursuits. First, chairs scoring high on this factor are effective at encouraging professional development efforts of faculty and encouraging faculty research and publication. Second, chairs mediate the relationship of faculty to the institution through providing informal faculty leadership, developing long-range department goals, and maintaining a conducive work climate. Third, issues of faculty evaluation are addressed through their effectiveness at recruiting and selecting faculty, and evaluating faculty performance.

The pattern of loadings on the forth factor suggested the title of **Manager**. Chairs who have higher means on this factor feel effective at the custodial activities of a department, such as preparing and proposing budgets, managing departmental resources, maintaining records, managing staff, and assigning duties to faculty.

Examining Top Quartiles of Department Chair Roles

Bragg (1981) asserts that the way an individual acts or behaves in occupying a status is a *role*. In this study, the measure of effectiveness within each of the four chair duty factors serves as an indication of behavior. She also indicates that chairs select from areas of responsibility they feel most capable of carrying out. Effectiveness factor scores provide a means to examine differences among chairs who indicate a preference for one or another area of the job of chair. In order to pursue this line, chairs who reported high effectiveness in each of the four factors were compared to all other chairs.

Table 1
Factor Analysis of Chair Effectiveness on Department Duties

Chair Duty	Rotated Factors I	II	III	IV
Leader				
Coordinate departmental activities with constituents	**.71**	.10	.03	.22
Plan and evaluate curriculum development	**.71**	-.06	.20	-.00
Solicit ideas to improve the department	**.62**	.11	.26	.11
Represent the department at professional meetings	**.54**	.25	.10	.07
Inform faculty of department, college and university concerns	**.47**	-.08	.07	.40
Plan and conduct department meetings	**.44**	.16	.06	.28
Participate in college and university committee work	**.43**	.01	.07	.23
Scholar				
Obtain resources for personal research	-.03	**.87**	.06	.03
Maintain research program and associated professional activities	.04	**.86**	.10	.01
Remain current within academic discipline	.12	**.71**	.17	-.07
Obtain and manage external funds (grants, contracts)	.13	**.65**	.13	.22
Select and supervise graduate students	.24	**.43**	.15	.02
Faculty Developer				
Encourage professional development efforts of faculty	.11	.16	**.67**	-.10
Provide informal faculty leadership	.19	.09	**.64**	.04
Encourage faculty research and publication	.19	.09	**.63**	.23
Recruit and select faculty	.03	.05	**.61**	.11
Develop and initiate long-range departmental goals	.34	.06	**.54**	.06
Maintain conducive work climate, including reducing conflicts	-.09	.06	**.54**	.28
Evaluate faculty performance	.09	.09	**.53**	.26
Represent department to administration	.19	.11	**.47**	.35
Manager				
Prepare and propose budgets	.13	.07	.17	**.77**
Manage department resources (finances, facilities, equipment)	.08	.05	.30	**.72**
Assure the maintenance of accurate departmental records	.34	.03	.06	**.61**
Manage non-Academic staff	.20	-.07	.19	**.49**
Assign teaching, research and other related duties to faculty	.34	-.02	.26	**.41**
Teach and advise students	.05	.12	.01	.05
Percent of total variance explained by factors	11.3	10.9	12.1	10.2

The sample was sorted by weighted factor mean for each of the four factors. The top quartile (n=123) for each factor was identified. One hundred and thirty-three chairs appeared in only one of the possible top quartiles. Of those, the highest number (51) were in the scholar group and the remainder were distributed relatively evenly among the remaining three factor groups (leader, 25; developer, 28; manager, 29). Of chairs who rated high effectiveness in more than one top

quartile group, the most frequent combination was leader/manager (67) and the least scholar/manager (33). Fifty-seven chairs appeared in three top quartiles. Leader/developer/manager was the most frequent combination (29). The remaining combinations, which all contain scholar, appeared much less frequently (leader/scholar/developer, 12; leader/scholar/manager, 9; scholar/developer/manager, 7). Eight respondents appeared in all four top quartiles.

Individuals in the top quartile for each factor were examined for significant differences from those reporting in the lower three quartiles on four groups of mediating variables. First, *personal* variables included: age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, motivation to serve as chair, whether chairs would continue to serve another term, whether chairs would accept a higher administrative position, and whether chairs considered themselves to be an academic faculty member, an administrator, or equally both. Second, *organizational* variables included whether the chair was hired by faculty alone, the dean or higher administrators, or equally by both; whether the chair was hired from inside or outside of the institution; faculty size; faculty age; and numbers of departmental support staff. Chairs' *positional* characteristics were reported through years served as chair, discipline, current academic rank, and rank when hired as chair. Finally, variables addressing behavioral *outcomes* were role conflict, role ambiguity, measures of institutional loyalty, job satisfaction, occupational stress, and academic productivity (the average number of books published per year since becoming department chair, the average number of articles published per year since becoming department chair, the number of papers presented at professional meetings in the previous year, and the number of professional meetings attended in the previous year).

Relationships of Personal Variables to Chair Effectiveness

When the personal variables were examined by analysis of variance, across all four factors, age, gender, ethnicity, academic rank, and marital status did not show significant differences between chairs reporting high and lower effectiveness scores. Differences did appear for attitudes expressed toward the job (Table 2). Most powerful was the issue of whether chairs considered themselves to be faculty, administrators, or equally both. Except in the developer factor, *equally both faculty and administrator* was reported more often by top quartile chairs than others. In addition, only top quartile developer chairs were more likely than other chairs to believe they would serve another term as chair. Only top quartile leader chairs were more likely to say that they would accept higher administrative positions than other chairs.

Identification of motivation to become chair was also a discriminating indicator of the levels of effectiveness in the four chair roles. In a previous study chairs were asked, in an open ended question, why they became department chair (Center for the Study of the Department Chair, 1990). Seven basic categories of responses emerged. Broadly, those categories were interpreted as intrinsic motivation (personal development, financial gain, chance to relocate, and desire for more control) and extrinsic motivation (lack of alternative candidate, drafted by dean or colleagues, out of a sense of duty—Seedorf, 1990). In this study, chairs were asked to indicate which of the seven categories of motivation to serve matched their own motivation. Responses were then recoded to reflect intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. All top quartile chairs except in the manager factor were significantly less likely to report extrinsic motivation for becoming chair than all other chairs. High scoring chairs in the developer and manager

factors were significantly more likely to report intrinsic motivation for becoming chair than all other chairs.

Table 2
Variables showing significant differences for top quartile of effective chairs in each role.

Variable Type	Leader Factor	Scholar Factor	Developer Factor	Manager Factor
Personal	•Would accept higher administrative position •Both faculty and administrator orientation •Intrinsic motivation •Not extrinsic motivation	•Both faculty and admin. orientation (no pure admin.) •Not extrinsic motivation	•Would serve again as chair •Intrinsic motivation •Not extrinsic motivation	•Both faculty and admin. orientation
Organizational	•No differences	•More clerical help in department	•Lower ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty in department	• No Differences
Positional	•Higher number of years of service	•Tend to come from hard disciplines	•Higher mean number of years served as chair	•Higher mean number of years served as chair
Outcome/ Productivity	•More job satisfaction •Less role ambiguity •Staying current stress •Program funds stress •Academic stress •Meeting stress •Attended more professional meetings	•More job satisfaction •Less role ambiguity •Less role conflict •Staying current stress •Program funds stress •Expectation stress •Lower academic stress •Publish more books per year •Publish more articles per year •Presented more papers •Attended more professional meetings	•More job satisfaction •Less role ambiguity •Staying current stress •Program funds stress	•More job satisfaction •Less role ambiguity •Staying current stress •Program funds stress •Academic stress

Relationships of Organizational Variables to Chair Effectiveness

Who hired chairs, whether chairs were hired from inside or outside of the institution, and faculty sizes all did not serve to discriminate among chairs role effectiveness. The ratio of non-tenured faculty to tenured faculty was significantly associated with effectiveness in the developer factor (fewer tenured faculty for each non-tenured faculty in high developer effectiveness chair's departments) and number of clerical staff in the scholar factor (the more effective chairs in this factor had more clerical staff).

Relationships of Positional Variables to Chair Effectiveness

Years of service as chair was significantly different between high and lower scoring chair roles of leader, manager, and developer, but not scholar. Specifically, as indicated in Table 3, the mean years of service for effective chairs was significantly higher, especially for those chairs in the top quartile of the manager role. Also, discipline differentiated between high and lower chair effectiveness in the factor of scholar. Chairs reporting higher effectiveness in the scholar role were more frequently from the hard sciences than soft.

Table 3
Comparison of mean number of years served as chair by chair role effectiveness scores.

Factor		Quartiles of Effectiveness Scores: Low n=123	2 n=123	3 n=123	High n=123
Leader[b]	Mean	3.5	4.2	3.6	5.3
	SD	3.8	3.8	3.0	4.9
Scholar	Mean	4.5	3.9	3.7	4.4
	SD	4.3	3.8	3.8	4.0
Developer[b]	Mean	3.1	4.1	4.7	4.6
	SD	2.9	3.5	4.8	4.1
Manager[bc]	Mean	3.1	3.5	5.0	5.2
	SD	3.5	3.1	4.4	4.4

Note: b= $p < .01$; c=$p < .001$

Relationships of Outcome Variables to Chair Effectiveness

The personal productivity variables (books, articles, papers, and meetings) revealed significant differences between high and lower scoring chairs on the scholar factor. Not surprisingly, effective scholar chairs had significantly greater numbers on each of the productivity variables than lower scoring scholar chairs. The only other instance where significant differences appeared for personal productivity variables was *number of professional meetings attended* in the leader factor. Chairs scoring in the top quartile of the leader role attended more meetings than other chairs.

The most universal variables for differentiating high scoring chairs from all others were job satisfaction and role ambiguity. Chairs in the top quartile of each factor reported that they were significantly more satisfied with the amount of work they are expected to do, the pace of their work, and their current work load, than chairs who reported that they were less effective on each factor. The questionnaire included a role ambiguity scale (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzmann, 1970).

In all four factor groups, chairs in the top quartile of factor means had significantly lower role ambiguity scores than other chairs (Table 4).

Table 4
A comparison of mean role ambiguity scores by chair role effectiveness scores.

		Quartiles of Effectiveness Scores			
Factor		Low n=123	2 n=123	3 n=123	High n=123
Leader[abc]	Mean	4.0	4.2	4.5	4.8
	SD	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.1
Scholar[abc]	Mean	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.8
	SD	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.2
Developer[abc]	Mean	3.9	4.3	4.5	4.8
	SD	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.3
Manager[abc]	Mean	3.9	4.4	4.4	4.8
	SD	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2

Note: a= $p < .05$; b=$p < .01$; c=$p < .001$; scores are based on a seven point scale

Institutional loyalty did not serve to discriminate among chairs on any factor and role conflict assisted only for scholar factor chairs (high scoring scholar chairs had significantly lower row conflict than all other chairs).

Although this study did not attempt to investigate the specific nature of stress in the department chair position, some stressors appeared as consistently bothersome to top quartile chairs. High percentages of all top quartile chairs reported *having insufficient time to stay current in my field* and *trying to gain financial support for department programs* as major stressors (Table 5).

Table 5
Percentages of top quartile chairs reporting serious stress across four chair roles.

Stress Item	Leader Factor	Scholar Factor	Developer Factor	Manager Factor
Having insufficient time to stay current in my academic field	67.2	55.7	63.1	68.9
Trying to gain financial support for department programs	63.1	57.4	50.8	58.2
Believing my academic career progress is not what it should be	50.8	35.2	42.6	50.8
Imposing excessively high self-expectations	48.3	50.0	44.3	46.7
Attending meetings which take up too much time	50.0	41.8	46.7	45.1

Note: Percent serious determined by a response of 4 or 5 categories on a five point Likert-type scale from low stress (1) to excessive stress (5)

Role Profiles of Effective Chairs

The Leader Role

Chairs in the top quartile of effectiveness on the leadership factor were significantly more likely to report that they were intrinsically motivated to become chair (interesting challenge, new opportunities) than other chairs and they were less likely than other chairs to indicate that they were extrinsically motivated to become chair (out of necessity, lack of alternative viable candidate).

Top quartile effective leader chairs, on the average, also had served as chair longer than other chairs. In addition to expressing a willingness to accept a higher administrative position, a significantly larger number of them also identified themselves as equally a faculty member and an administrator. They also attended more professional meetings in the last year than other chairs. High scoring leader chairs rated job satisfaction higher and had less role ambiguity. In addition to serious stress from *having insufficient time to stay current in my field* and *trying to gain financial support for department programs*, high percentages of these chairs reported *believing my academic career progress is not what it should be* and *attending meetings which take up too much time* as major stressors.

The Scholar Role

Chairs in the top quartile scholar effectiveness reported they were not extrinsically motivated to become chair significantly more frequently than other chairs. Significantly more of the scholar chairs came from hard discipline departments than soft classified departments. There were no chairs in the top quartile scholar group who considered themselves as solely administrators and significantly greater numbers indicating they were both a faculty member and an administrator than other chairs. Scholar chairs also had more clerical help than other chairs and engaged in more scholarly activity. These top quartile chairs had higher means on all four academic variables than other chairs: average number of books published per year since becoming department chair, average number of articles published per year since becoming department chair, the number of papers presented at professional meetings in the previous year, and the number of professional meetings attended in the previous year. Possibly as a result, these chairs reported significantly less role ambiguity and role conflict, and higher job satisfaction. However, high percentages of these chairs reported stress from *having insufficient time to stay current in my field* and *trying to gain financial support for department programs* as high stressors. Fewer numbers indicated that *believing my academic career progress is not what it should be* caused them stress.

The Faculty Developer Role

Chairs in the top quartile of effectiveness in faculty development were significantly more likely to report that they were intrinsically motivated to become chair and they were less likely to be extrinsically motivated to become chair (being drafted by dean or colleagues). These chairs served as chair significantly longer than other chairs and they were more likely to indicate that

they would continue to serve as chair after this current term. In addition, faculty developer chairs worked in departments with a lower ratio of tenured faculty for each non-tenured faculty. High scoring developer chairs rated job satisfaction higher and had less role ambiguity than other chairs. They also reported *having insufficient time to stay current in my field* and *trying to gain financial support for department programs* as major stressors

The Manager Role

Chairs in the top quartile of manager effectiveness were not significantly different than other chairs in terms of intrinsic or extrinsic motivation to become chair. These chairs had served as chair significantly longer and were more likely to consider themselves as equally both faculty and administrators than other chairs. Manager chairs also rated job satisfaction higher and reported less role ambiguity. In addition to *having insufficient time to stay current in my field* and *trying to gain financial support for department programs*, high percentages of these chairs reported *believing my academic career progress is not what it should be* as a major stressor.

Discussion

Role of Scholar

Although anecdotal literature on the department chair has frequently mentioned chairs' pressure to continue their academic pursuits, few empirical studies have investigated this aspect of the chair role (Moses & Roe, 1990). It is clear from this study that *scholar* is an important part of the department chair role in research institutions. For many chairs, this is their most comfortable role (McLaughlin, et al., 1975), however the demands of the position of chair make finding time for research virtually impossible. Eighty-six percent of department chairs in Moses and Roe's study (1990) believed their other chair responsibilities

caused them to significantly reduce their scholarly activities, and for some their scholarship essentially ceased.

Not surprisingly, those chairs who had high means on this factor also indicated a significantly greater productivity in academic scholarship than chairs who reported that they were less effective. These chairs tended to come from hard disciplines (more clearly established research paradigms) more often than other chairs. Seedorf (1990) suggests that returning to scholarship after a chair position is more difficult the longer an individual has been chair. This appears to be particularly true in hard disciplines. Smart and McLaughlin (1985) for example report strategies chemistry chairs used to keep current, such as second authoring more papers and eliciting more graduate student help with research projects. Overall, it may be more difficult to remain academically current as a chair in hard disciplines due to the nature of the sciences.

Notably, only top quartile chairs in the scholar factor reported significantly less role conflict than other chairs. Might this suggest that chairs who perceive themselves as effective scholars have less difficulty and conflict with the dual academic and administrative roles of their positions? These *effective scholar* chairs have reduced role conflict by finding ways to continue to accomplish both sets of tasks. This may be facilitated by the fact that highly effective scholar chairs had significantly higher numbers of clerical staff available to assist them.

Role of Faculty Developer

Perceptions of those chairs who are more effective in the faculty developer role are also revealing. These chairs are most likely to take on another term as chair. In addition, effective faculty developer chairs tended to be in departments where there was a greater proportion of non-tenured faculty than other chairs—an appropriate measure of the faculty career age of a department. Possibly, with a

greater ratio of untenured faculty, these chairs perceived their role as promoting junior faculty members or, possibly departments selected chairs who could fulfill this need. Regardless, it is consistent with Blackburn's (1985) faculty socialization work that non-tenured faculty have considerably more development needs than tenured faculty.

McLaughlin et al (1975) and Smart and Elton (1976) factor a list of items which is essentially identical to the current study's faculty developer role, (what McLaughlin calls the *leadership* role and Smart and Elton entitle a *faculty* role), with the notable exception of *representing the department to administration* (Table 6). Here, it is possible to imagine that defending the department to administration is a fundamental faculty support function. Bragg, in her 1981 study of a single institution, also identified a faculty oriented chair role which included responsibilities of recruitment, facilitation, and development of faculty.

Bragg (1981) also identifies program oriented chairs as those who are concerned with program and curriculum improvement. Although those activities are components of factors identified in both McLaughlin et al, and Smart and Elton's, studies they have never appeared as a unique orientation. That is also true of this study. McLaughlin places program concerns in the leadership role of chairs and Smart and Elton saw them as an element of the coordinator role of chairs. The current study places them as part of the leadership role of chairs.

Table 6
Comparison of Factor Groupings of Chair Duties among McLaughlin, Montgomery, and Malpass (1975); Smart and Elton (1976); and the Current Study

McLaughlin			Smart & Elton				
1	2	3	1	2	3	4	
							Leader
	X			X			Coordinate departmental activities with constituents
		X		X			Plan and evaluate curriculum development
		X		X			Solicit ideas to improve the department
	X			X			Represent the department at professional meetings
	X			X			Inform faculty of department, college and university concerns
	X			UF			Plan and conduct department meetings
	X			X			Participate in college and university committee work
							Scholar
							Obtain resources for personal research
							Maintain research program and associated professional activities
							Remain current within academic discipline
X					X		Obtain and manage external funds (grants, contracts)
X					X		Select and supervise graduate students
							Faculty Developer
		X	X				Encourage professional development efforts of faculty
		X	X				Provide informal faculty leadership
X		X	X				Encourage faculty research and publication
		X	X				Recruit and select faculty
		X	UF				Develop and initiate long-range departmental goals
		X	X				Maintain conducive work climate, including reducing conflicts
		X	X				Evaluate faculty performance
	X			X			Represent department to administration
							Manager
	X		X		X		Prepare and propose budgets
	X				X		Manage department resources (finances, facilities, equipment)
	X					X	Assure the maintenance of accurate departmental records
	X					X	Manage non-Academic staff
	X			X			Assign teaching, research and other related duties to faculty
X						X	Teach and advise students (UF)

Note: UF = Unfactored
McLaughlin 1 = Academic; 2 = Administrative; 3 = Leadership
Smart & Elton 1 = Faculty; 2 = Coordinator; 3 = Research; 4 = Instructional

Role of the Leader/Manager

This study identifies a dichotomy of leadership and management roles for the department chair. This differs somewhat from the other chair role studies. McLaughlin, Montgomery, and Malpass' (1975) factor analysis of importance of

chair duties placed the majority of the items which appear in the leader and manager factors in this study into a single factor called the *administrative* role. Smart and Elton's (1976) factor analysis of chair time use factored items into a *coordinator* role which matched this study's leader role, but distributed the elements from this study's manager role into a variety of other factors (Table 6). Bragg (1981) saw *externally* oriented chairs as focused on department image and representing the department outside. *Management* oriented chairs in her study took on coordination roles.

The top quartile chairs in the leader and manager factors had a number of similarities and some important differences. First, of chairs who appeared in the top quartile of more than one factor, the leader/manger combination was the most likely. Both leader and manager effective chairs served longer. More broadly, only top quartile scholar chairs did not exhibit a relationship between effectiveness and time in office. Once again, this points to the long-standing discussion concerning the inappropriateness of providing inadequate training for new department chairs and the tendency for chairs to serve single terms. The mean years of service for high scoring leader chairs was 5.3 years and for high scoring manager chairs 5.2 years (effective scholar chairs were lowest with 4.4 years of service). On average, the chairs who consider themselves to be effective in leader and manager activities have served more than a single term as chair.

Another similarity of these two groups is that high scoring chairs in both groups were less likely to consider themselves as solely faculty and more likely as equally both a faculty member and an administrator. Much of the job of department chair entails communicating both faculty concerns to administration and administrative concerns to faculty (Tucker, 1984). Effective chairs in leader and manager factors seem to be able to function from both points of view.

Effective chairs in all factor groups except manger indicated that they were not motivated to become department chair for extrinsic reasons. Leader and manger top quartile chairs showed significant intrinsic motivation. This seems to suggest that effective chairs wanted the job. Anecdotal evidence indicates that chairs seldom admit to wanting to be chair but it may be an important component of effective chairing. Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) highlight a desire to provide department and university service as an important aspect of later career stages of faculty and indeed chairs average 26 years between the time they received their bachelor's degree and the time they became department chair (Carroll, 1990). Oddly, effective manager chairs were not significantly different from the rest of their cohort in either being motivated to become chair for intrinsic reasons or not being motivated for extrinsic reasons. When the individual items contained within intrinsic motivation in this study are examined separately, top quartile manager chairs were significantly more likely to have been motivated to become chair in order to be more in control of their environment. Certainly, the items that loaded into the manager factor (prepare budgets, manage resources, maintain records, manage staff) are the components most concerned with environmental control.

Two other aspects of effective leader chairs are also noteworthy. First, while there was no significant difference in terms of papers presented, these chairs attended significantly more professional meetings than other chairs. Attending meetings for these chairs is most likely an extension of the external communication and leadership function of chairing a department. They are effective in representing and promoting the department, not only within the institution, but within their respective disciplines as well. Second, effective leader chairs were more likely than other chairs to accept a higher position in administration if it was available.

It is tempting from these data and others to begin talking about types of chairs. If there are chair types, they will most likely be a complex combination and interaction of skills in the various components of the chair job that have been discussed here. Even though effective leader chairs are frequently also effective manager chairs, a substantial number of effective developer/manager combinations appeared as well. While effective scholar chairs were the highest number of chairs who did not report high effectiveness in other factors (41.5%), the majority of effective scholar chairs did appear in the top quartile of another factor (58.5%). What this study does show is a usable taxonomy of chair roles and some characteristics of those individuals who perceive themselves to be effective in these roles. Much work remains if more generalizations are to be validated or helpful in the development and productivity of department chairs.

References

Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process. *Journal of Higher Education, 52*(6), pp. 598-614.

Bare, A. (1986). Managerial behavior of college chairpersons and administrators. *Research in Higher Education, 24*(2), pp. 128-138.

Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(3), pp. 195-203.

Blackburn, R. T. (1985). Faculty career development: Theory and practice. In S. M. Clark, & D. R. Lewis (Ed.), *Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity* (pp. 55-85). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bragg, A. K. (1981). *Relationship between the role definition and socialization of academic department heads.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1987). *A classification of institutions of higher education* . Berkeley, CA: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Carroll, J. B. (1990). *Career paths of department chairs in higher education.* Doctoral Dissertation, Washington State University.

Center for the Study of Department Chair (1990). Why chairs serve. *Center for the Study of the Department Chair Newsletter, 1*(3). Pullman, Washington: Department of Educational Administration, Washington State University.

Creswell, J. W., & Bean, J. P. (1981). Research output, socialization, and the Biglan model. *Research in Higher Education, 15*(1), pp. 69-91.

Creswell, J. W., Wheeler, D. W., Seagren, A. T., Egly, N. J., & Beyer, K. D. (1990). *The academic chairperson's handbook*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Hoyt, D. P. (1979). The measurement of administrative effectiveness of the academic department head. *Research in Higher Education, 10*(4), pp. 291-303.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Kachigan, S. K. (1982). *Multivariate statistical analysis.* New York: Radius Press

Lee, D. E. (1985). Department chairpersons' perceptions of the role in three institutions. *Perception and Motor Skills, 61*, pp. 23-49.

McCarthy, M. M., Kuh, G. D., Newell, L. J., & Iacona, C. M. (1988). *Under scrutiny: The educational administration professorate*. Tempe, Arizona: University Council for Educational Administration.

McLaughlin, G. W., Montgomery, J. R., & Malpass, L. F. (1975). Selected characteristics, roles, goals, and satisfactions of department chairmen in state and land-grant institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 3*, pp. 243-259.

Moses, I., & Roe, E. (1990). *Heads and chairs: Managing academic departments.* Queensland, Australia: University of Queensland Press.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 15,* pp. 150-163.

Seedorf, R. (1990). *Transition to leadership: The university department chair.* Doctoral Dissertation, Washington State University.

Smart, J. C. (1976). Duties performed by department chairmen in Holland's model environments. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 68*(2), pp. 194-204.

Smart, J. C., & Elton, C. F. (1976). Administrative roles of department chairmen. In J. C. Smart, & J. R. Montgomery (Ed.), *New directions for institutional research: Examining departmental management, No. 10* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smart, J. C., & McLaughlin, G. W. (1985). Administrative service and research performance: A study of chemistry department heads. *Research in Higher Education, 22*(1), pp. 31-42.

Tucker, A. (1984). *Chairing the academic department* (2nd ed.). New York: American Council on Education.